

R E M A R K S

Claims 3 and 4 currently remain in the application. Claims 1 and 2 have been canceled, claims 5-12 have been and withdrawn and claim 3 is herein amended.

Regarding the matter of Paragraph 4, applicant hereby formally affirms that claims 5-12 are withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention although it goes without saying that applicant reserves the right to later submit these claims in a divisional application.

Regarding the matter of drawings in Paragraph 6, applicant is hereby submitting a set of formal drawings such that the informal drawings earlier filed with the application will be thereby substituted. Examination of said formal drawings is requested.

Claims 1 and 2 are herein canceled and hence the rejection in Paragraph 8 of the Official Letter is now a moot point.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Tsuruoka. In part in view of the reason for rejection by the Examiner, claim 3 is herein amended to more narrowly limit the nature of the unevenness of the detection surface as having a plurality of mutually adjacent protrusions that are shaped such that they become narrower in the direction of the protrusion. Unevenness of this kind is supported by Figs. 4A, 4B and 4C and hence no problem of introduction of new matter is thereby invoked. Thus, it is believed that this amendment is enterable. In order to make this characterization of the embodiments as illustrated by Figs. 4A, 4B and 4C clearer, a relevant portion of the specification has also been amended. This is believed to provide a further support to amended claim 3.

This narrowing of the scope of claim 3 is believed to obviate the Examiner's rejection of claim 3 because this particular surface shape of the detection surface is not disclosed or even hinted at by Tsuruoka.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Tsuruoka in view of Kato. Claim 4 is a dependent claim, inheriting all limitations of claim 3 from which it depends. Since Kato does not disclose or even hint at a detection surface with unevenness as narrowly limited by amended claim 3, it is to be logically concluded that claim 4 is now not obvious although these two references are considered in combination.

In summary, it is believed that the present Amendment is totally responsive to the Office Action and hence that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Applicant takes this opportunity to submit herewith a certified copy of a Japanese Patent Application serving as the priority document.

Respectfully submitted,



Keiichi Nishimura
Registration No. 29,093

October 31, 2005
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP
500 12th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, California 94607
Telephone: (510) 663-1100
Telefax: (510) 663-0920